

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11-20 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

Claims 1-8, 11-14 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ouchi (U.S. Patent 6,493,149) in view of Lambert (U.S. Patent 6,288,815). Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ouchi in view of Lambert and Bierhuzen (U.S. Patent 6,839,095). Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ouchi in view of Lambert, Bierhuzen, and Ito (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0180933). Claims 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ouchi in view of Lambert and Shahzad (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0191154).

In the Amendment of August 22, 2006, Applicants argued that claim 1 is patentable because no reasonable combination of the cited references teaches or suggests a scrolling unit comprising a plurality of spirally-arranged lens cells, as recited in claim 1. This arrangement of a plurality of spirally-arranged lens cells permits a small curvature between the spirally-arranged lens cells in comparison with a single lens, thereby reducing a distortion of an image during scanning and aiding in uniform light distribution.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lambert teaches this limitation and refers to Figures 8A and 8B of Lambert and col. 11, lines 10-26 of Lambert (Office Action, pages 2-3). However, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Applicants assert that neither Lambert nor any other cited reference, nor any combination of the cited references teaches or suggests a scrolling unit comprising a plurality of spirally arranged lens cells.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Q74903
U.S. Application No. 10/811,375

Figures 7B, 8A, and 8B of Lambert each clearly illustrate only a single spiral lens, though the tilt (tightness) of the spiral varies in the three figures. Additionally, col. 11, lines 10-26 of Lambert clearly describe: “an implementation where the moving array of FIGS. 1, 3, or 5 is replaced by a *single* cylinder lens 33 that spirals on a disk 32, as shown in more detail in the wireframe model of FIG. 8A” (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicants submit that Lambert fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation and that none of the other cited references remedy this deficiency of Lambert.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over any reasonable combination of the cited references and that claims 2-8 and 11-20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-8 and 11-20 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Q74903
U.S. Application No. 10/811,375

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 14, 2007